



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,909	05/09/2005	Johannes Hafner	003D.0031.U1(US)	7335
29683	7590	05/31/2007	EXAMINER	
HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC			STAHL, MICHAEL J	
4 RESEARCH DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212			2874	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
05/31/2007	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/510,909	HAFNER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mike Stahl	2874

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7,9 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 6-8 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 5 refers to “the clamping regions”, but no clamping regions were defined earlier in claim 5 or in parent claim 1. Claims 6-7 are rejected by dependence from claim 5. Current policy still expects an art rejection to be made if an interpretation that avoids the indefiniteness can be mustered. Accordingly, examiner will assume in this action that claim 5 properly introduces clamping regions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-5 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fahrnbauer et al. (US 6599026) in view of Chien (US 5181268).

Claim 1: Fahrnbauer discloses a fiber-optic cable arrangement with a plug housing, having a guide segment and a clamping segment including **16** and a portion of **15** for attaching the fiber-optic cable to the plug, wherein the clamping segment has projections (transverse ribs of **19**) on the inside for anchoring to the fiber-optic cable, which are pressed into the cable sheath by crimping, further wherein the fiber-optic cable has an outer sheathing **4**, an inner sheathing **3**, and a fiber-optic **2**, and the clamping segment has projections on its inner wall for crimping with the inner and outer sheathings of the fiber-optic cable (projections within regions **15** and **16** are applied to the inner and outer sheathings respectively). See figs. 1-4. The guide segment is being interpreted as the rightmost (as drawn in fig. 4) portion of **15** just beyond but not including the rightmost projection **19**. The fiber-optic and the inner sheathing extend into said guide segment, since the end face **5** is surrounded by inner sheathing **3** and extends up to the boundary between **15** and **17** (col. 4 lns. 7-10). However, Fahrnbauer does not specifically disclose an additional protective layer for the fiber **2**.

Chien discloses a fiber protection system including an inner sheathing **16**, an interfacial layer **13**, and an outer sheathing **18**. It is noted that layer **13** is a protective layer. Chien teaches that the layer **13** enhances the strippability of the outer sheathing **18**. Thus it would have been obvious to a skilled person to include an intermediate protective layer similar to **13** between the inner and outer sheathings **3** and **4** of Fahrnbauer. A skilled person would have been motivated

to do so because the outer sheathing 4 in Fahrnbauer must be stripped over a length 'd' to fit in the region 15 of the housing, and Chien teaches that adding an appropriate intermediate layer makes it easier to accomplish this operation. The fiber-optic cable arrangement according to the proposed combination meets all the limitations of claim 1.

Claim 2: The clamping segment is divided into two regions: a first region (this is the portion of 15 which excludes the guide segment as interpreted above) that lies toward the guide segment and has an inner diameter adapted to the diameter of the inner cable sheathing; and a second region 16 that lies on a cable-side end of the plug housing and has an inner diameter adapted to the diameter of the outer cable sheathing; wherein the length of the stripped outer sheathing corresponds essentially to a small specified dimension of the length of the guide segment plus that of the first clamping region.

Claim 3: The projections form a serrated profile.

Claim 4: The guide segment has a cylindrical recess for the fiber with the protective layer, in which the fiber is held with little radial play and by means of which the face side of the fiber is somewhat retracted with respect to a plug-in end of the plug housing.

Claim 5: The clamping segment includes conically expanding clamping regions, particularly the rightmost projection 19 in part 16 and the leftmost projection 19 in part 15 together define clamping regions which conically expand toward a cable-side end of the plug housing.

Claims 9-10: The combination of Fahrnbauer and Chien meets all the limitations of these claims.

Response to Arguments

The remarks regarding the prior art rejection of the last Office action have been considered, but are moot in view of the alternate interpretation of Fahrnbauer relied upon in the present action.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and if the indefiniteness rejection of claims 6-7 is overcome. As to claim 6, Fahrnbauer does not teach or suggest the recited cone angle in combination with all the other recited elements. As to claims 7-8, Fahrnbauer provides no teaching or suggestion to arrange the projections in the specific manners claimed, in combination with all the other recited elements.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiries about this letter may be directed to examiner Stahl at the number below. Inquiries of a general or clerical nature (e.g., a request for a missing form or paper, etc.) should be directed to the technical support staff supervisor at 571-272-1626. Official correspondence which is eligible for submission by facsimile and which pertains to this application may be faxed to 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Questions about the Private PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mike Stahl MJS
2874
571-272-2360

May 29, 2007



Rodney Bovernick
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800